

APPENDIX.

SPEECH

OF

HON. MOSES W. FIELD, OF MICHIGAN, IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 28, 1874.

The bill in relation to national currency, free banking, and other purposes being under consideration—

Mr. FIELD, in the opening portion of his speech, discussed the question of internal revenue and stamp taxes, contending substantially that, with a proper adjustment of the tariff on foreign imports, these taxes might be still further reduced, and that at no distant day they might be wholly repealed. In support of this proposition Mr. FIELD submitted very elaborate statistical tables, showing wherein internal taxes could be abolished, and the sources from which the deficiency thus caused could be supplied by a proper discrimination on the foreign products and manufactures admitted to our markets. As in subsequent parts of the speech Mr. FIELD has re-stated, in a very clear and exact manner, the conclusion to be drawn from these tables, they are omitted from this publication.

Mr. FIELD continued the discussion of the subject in the following words, which, for convenience of reference, have been placed under sub-heads:

TAXATION ON FOREIGN PRODUCTIONS THE TRUE POLICY.

As I have stated, the revenue derived from imports is paid almost wholly by foreign labor. I have heard gentlemen here speak of the burdens imposed upon the American people by tariff taxation, but this is a great mistake. The revenue derived from imports is wrung from the hands of foreign producers. When they approach our markets with the products of their labor, they are required to call at the captain's office and settle the duties which our tariff requires. It is like

the toll which is sometimes paid in crossing a bridge that leads to a market. That toll comes from the person who seeks that market, the producer, not the consumer. And so with the products of foreign labor. Before they can be laid down or sold to consumers in our markets the producer is required to call at the custom-house and settle the duties, and the receipts into the Treasury from this source during the last fiscal year have been \$184,929,041.

COMMENTS ON MR. BECK'S FREE-TRADE SPEECH.

The gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. BECK,] in a recent speech on the finances, made some reference to the tariff, and in the course of his remarks he characterized the collection of revenue on importations of foreign manufactures as "the outrageous system of tariff taxation that is bringing about all our financial and commercial troubles." I confess my surprise on hearing this remark, for the gentleman, being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, must be familiar with the tariff, and the gentleman knows that the free list embraces all commodities not conveniently produced in the United States, and that duties under the existing tariff are imposed only on such manufactures and productions of foreign countries as compete with like productions in our own. I fail, therefore, to see how custom-house taxation on foreign products can disturb our finances, as such taxation, while yielding a large revenue to the Treasury, can only have the effect to stimulate labor and augment productions in this country.

SILK GOODS.

Now, if all the silk goods required to supply our markets could be produced in this country, more laborers would be employed here, creating greater demands for labor, and the money required to pay for the labor would be expended here, instead of being shipped to foreign countries to reward and support labor there, while thousands remain idle in the United States for want of employment.

TAKING WORK OUT OF THE COUNTRY ROBBING AMERICAN LABORERS.

If I understand the gentleman, he is anxious to stop all the works now in operation in this country, and he favors a policy which would discharge the workmen now employed in our workshops and factories, and employ people in Europe and Asia to do the work to supply our markets, and the gentleman proposes to ship gold and silver to pay for their labor. If I understand the gentleman, the "remodeling of the tariff" so as to secure this result will, in his opinion, improve our finances and make us wealthy and prosperous. Considering that labor is wealth, I fail to perceive any advantage in the proposed transfer of our diversified employments to foreign countries; on the contrary, I affirm that if the policy of the gentleman be carried into execution it would lead us swiftly and with certainty to ruin and wide-spread disaster. It would, moreover, rob the Treasury of the required revenue, and rob our industrious people of a large share of their labor.

I desire to comment further on another part of the gentleman's speech, and that I may do him no injustice, I will ask to have the paragraphs which I have marked read, and I send them to the Clerk's desk for that purpose.

The Clerk read as follows :

I rose principally for the purpose of calling attention to one portion of the tariff question. There is a highly respectable set of gentlemen here, or were lately, known as the representatives of the Silk Association of America, whose books are no doubt on all your tables, who are seeking in every way to increase the tariff on silk manufactures, which is now 60 per cent. in gold, equal on an average to 75 per cent. in the currency of the country. They are making complaint as though they were about to be ruined, because a few mixed ribbons that have some cotton or some wool in them have been allowed to come into the country at a tax on the consumer of 50 per cent. gold. They are here clamoring for Congress to increase the duties on them also to the 60 per cent. rule, in order, as they claim, to make the tax uniform, and protect them in their industries.

Several of these gentlemen. I will not say where, have been discussing this question in my presence. And when I was insisting upon putting the tariff upon all these articles down to 50 per cent., instead of allowing mixed ribbons to be advanced to 60, as being a sufficient protection and bonus to them, the cry was at

once raised by them, "You will drive us out of business if you do that: we can not live at that figure." The question was then asked, "What is the amount of your production of silk?" The answer was, "About \$30,000,000 a year." What is the amount of silk imported? The books show that is about \$30,000,000; therefore the consumption of silk is about \$60,000,000 — \$30,000,000 of it imported. Counting all the imports at 60 per cent., we get a revenue of about \$18,000,000 out of a consumption of \$60,000,000. Reduce the tariff to 50 per cent, and drive all these gentlemen out of the business, if you please, the consumption of silk in this country will not be less, but by the natural operation of the increase of the people, and in consequence of the reduction of duty, the consumption would doubtless reach \$70,000,000. Fifty per cent. upon \$70,000,000 would produce \$35,000,000 of revenue if all these manufacturers should quit the business.

They state that all their machinery, all their material, all their property, at the highest estimate they put upon it, will reach only \$15,000,000. They employ, say, twelve thousand men, beside women and children. It is obvious from their own statements, and will be apparent to every gentleman who looks at it, that if you reduce the duties on silk from 60 per cent. to 50 per cent., and, if you please, drive all these men out of the manufacture entirely, you would instantly get \$35,000,000 of revenue instead of \$18,000,000. In that way, in one year, you could get an excess of revenue which would enable you to pay them their \$15,000,000, every dollar that they have invested in the business, and you would have \$2,000,000, or enough to furnish \$1,000 apiece to each man they employ, with which he could buy a farm in the West and stock it. We would get \$35,000,000 a year from the silk consumption alone, from which we are now getting only \$18,000,000. And yet these men are clamoring for a still further increase of protection to their productions, which would result in diminishing our revenues. That is only one case; there are hundreds of others of the same sort, illustrating equally well the working of the present high protective, anti-revenue tariff taxation.

A DREARY SUGGESTION—A PLAN FOR IMPROVING THE FINANCES BY PAU- PERIZING THE PEOPLE.

Mr. FIELD. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky says it requires \$60,000,000 worth of silk to supply the American markets, and at the present time our factories produce about one-half that quantity, the residue of the supply, say \$30,000,000, coming from abroad, and yielding \$18,000,000 revenue to the Treasury. Now, if the \$30,000,000 worth of silk which we imported last year had been manufactured in the United States, at least twelve thousand more laborers would have found employment here in the production of the work, and the shipment of \$30,000,000 to pay the foreign laborers would not have drained the country of that amount of treasure. But the gentleman, not satisfied with robbing our people, with one-half of this labor, now proposes that all this work shall be done in foreign countries, and with that view he favors a reduction of the duties on silk goods as "a revenue measure," and to "help the finances." He says, put the duty at a point low enough to drive American

manufacturers out of the business; in that event all the silk goods to supply our markets will be produced abroad, and, although our people will send off gold across the Atlantic to pay for the labor employed there in making the silks for the American people, yet the duties on the importations of the goods would swell the revenues of the Treasury. He thinks it would help our financial situation to ship \$60,000,000 in gold instead of the \$30,000,000 now required to pay for such manufactures in Europe.

SNATCHING LABOR OUT OF THE HANDS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

This is the grand financial and economic scheme of the gentleman from Kentucky. He says we now pay foreign labor \$30,000,000 to make our silks in part, and in order to offer them more of our work he proposes to say to the men and women at work in our great factories, "Get out; this is your country, but you have no rights here that your representatives are bound to respect." The gentleman proposes to "drive out" by hostile legislation the manufacturers in our workshops producing \$30,000,000 annually of silks in the United States, and consequently creating that much of wealth in our own country—this young industry, now maintaining here over two hundred firms in the business, employing over twelve thousand persons in the work, and paying over \$6,000,000 in wages per annum to our people. Now, if the gentleman's theory be correct with regard to silks, it will apply to all other industries; and, if carried out, we should exhibit the spectacle of a great nation of intelligent laborers—laborers doing the voting and governing the country for their own welfare and independence—adopting a policy which would transfer all their useful industries to foreign lands, strip them completely of their work, leaving at home a vast multitude of idle people, without work, without morals, and without civilization.

MAY GOD SAVE US.

May God save us, Mr. Speaker, from such a deplorable condition of dependence and slavery. Sir, we want no ornamental figure-heads in this country. We want active, useful people, and the diversified pursuits to give employment for all, that from our many industries we may witness one prosperity. If our work be done at home it is wealth and gain, if done abroad it is poverty and loss; and the \$30,000,000 sent abroad last year to pay for silk work drains our country of that much treasure, and robs our countrymen of that amount of labor.

Which policy, sir, I ask, is the best for

a nation of laborers, the policy which would strip them of their occupations and support labor in other countries, or that other policy which would secure to them the labor required to supply home demands and their home markets?

PRICES CHANGEABLE AS THE WEATHER-COCK.

The gentleman makes no calculation, too, for changes in the prices of silk goods should the plan he suggests be carried out. Let him buy up the silk works in this country and destroy them as proposed. Turn out of employment the twelve thousand people now supported by this industry, and what would be the result? Why, high prices for silk goods would be inevitable. The destruction of our silk manufactories would cause an advance in prices for silks in Europe, and instead of getting the silks for \$60,000,000, undoubtedly 50 per cent. more money would be required, making the cost, say, \$90,000,000. Meanwhile, our people deprived of a large amount of work, and consequently suffering serious loss and inconvenience, the revenues of the Treasury, instead of increasing, would drop to the poverty line of repudiation and disgrace.

"KILLING THE GOOSE."

If the policy be worth anything, I say, it should be applied to all manufacturing industries, and in carrying out the death-dealing scheme we should plunder the people of their mechanical work, reduce them to rude and barbarous employments, and thus kill the goose that lays the golden egg, not only for the Treasury, but for the prosperity and happiness of the American people.

THE DUTY ON BUTTER PAID BY THE CANADIANS, PRICES FIXED BY "SUPPLY AND DEMAND."

I find by the statement of the Bureau of Statistics that for the last fiscal year the importations of butter were 4,178,224 pounds, which, with the duty at 4 cents per pound, yielded \$167,128 revenue. Now, the price of butter in our markets was not affected by this importation, but the Canadians or others who shipped this butter took the American price, the same price our farmers got for a like quality, paying a duty, however, of 4 cents per pound before the butter could be sold in our markets. If we remit the duty on butter the foreign producer would realize just that much more. It can not be claimed that by repealing the duty the price of butter in our markets would be 4 cents per pound less. Prices are not fixed by law; they are not regulated by treaties; they are controlled and fixed by the natural law of supply and demand. And as our domestic pro-

ducers furnish the overwhelming supply, you will see that prices in American markets are fixed here, uninfluenced by the insignificant quantity which from year to year may be imported. The annual production of butter by the United States is estimated by the Department of Agriculture at 600,000,000 pounds, and with this supply in our own country it is impossible for prices to be affected by the small quantity imported.

CHEESE, POULTRY, BACON, AND TALLOW.

Cheese was imported amounting to 3,440,436 pounds, paying a duty of 4 cents per pound, and yielding in the aggregate \$137,618. This amount was paid into the Treasury by the foreign producer of cheese.

Poultry was imported amounting to \$93,767. The duty being 10 per cent., the Canadians were obliged to pay \$9,376 into the Treasury before they could sell their poultry in our markets.

The duty on hams is 2 cents per pound, and 118,852 pounds having been imported, the Treasury received \$2,377 in gold on foreign bacon and hams.

The duty on tallow is 1 cent per pound, and the duty on lard is 2 cents per pound, yielding a handsome revenue to the Treasury.

FIRE-WOOD—THE REPEAL OF THE DUTY PUT FORTY THOUSAND DOLLARS INTO THE POCKETS OF THE CANADIANS.

Fire-wood was imported in 1872 to the amount of \$201,960, paying a duty of 20 per cent., and yielding to the Treasury \$40,392; but on the 1st of August, 1872, this duty was repealed, and since that time no revenue has been collected or received from this source. It was a great mistake, in my judgment, to repeal this duty, and I propose to reinstate it as it was prior to 1872. Living as I do upon the border, and seeing the Canadian and the American selling wood in the same market, I will speak of fire-wood as an illustration of the ground I have taken that customs duties are paid by foreigners. Prior to August 1, 1872, the duty was 20 per cent., and before the Canadian could dispose of his wood in our market he was obliged to call at the custom-house and pay the duties. It is hardly worth while for me to state for it is a notorious fact, that in every case the foreign producer accepts the American market price for his wood. To illustrate, I will suppose the price to have been five dollars per cord, and the duty amounting to one dollar per cord; then the Canadian realizes four dollars per cord for his wood, while the American in the same market, for the same quality of wood, gets the full market price of

five dollars, for he has no duty to pay. But after the 1st of August the Canadian disposed of his wood in our market, and, there being no longer a duty upon it, he went home with the entire avails, receiving the same price as the American for the same quality of wood. The market price was not altered by the reduction of duty. The price in the market continued, with slight variations, for a short time, and then the price went up. The Forty-second Congress, therefore, in repealing the duty on fire-wood, generously put into the pockets of the Canadians at least \$40,000 in gold per annum.

HAY.

The duty on hay is 20 per cent., yielding to the Treasury last year \$81,235, and in 1872 the revenue derived from this source was \$140,432. Some gentlemen may think that the price is made by reason of this duty 20 per cent. higher all over the country. I wish it could be so. I should be very glad if by imposing high duties we could raise the price of the hay and the wheat and the potatoes produced in the West and all over this great country. But such is not the case. The quantity imported as compared with the domestic production is too insignificant to affect the price in any case or at any point. The total value of the hay imported last year was less than \$500,000, whereas the value of the crop of the United States is estimated at \$400,000,000. Therefore, to assert that the quantity imported has any effect upon the prices in the American markets would be as absurd as to contend that a glass of lager-beer thrown into the river at the Point of Rocks would produce such a flood in the Potomac as to sweep the Washington Monument into the Chesapeake bay.

HOPS—THE DUTY SHOULD BE TEN CENTS PER POUND.

The duty on hops is 5 cents per pound, and my desire is that it should be raised to 10 cents per pound. Why should we allow the Canadians to come into our markets and glut them with their hops, paying only 5 cents per pound for the right and privilege of selling them here, when by imposing 10 cents per pound we would double the revenue? And I propose that we shall, after the 1st of July next, charge the Canadians at least ten cents per pound for the privilege of selling their hops in our markets. These markets belong to the American people. The country is theirs, and the markets of the country belong to them; and they have a right to demand that foreigners, when they seek our markets shall be required to call and pay duties before they

can compete with the farmers here on their own ground. The farmers of Wisconsin, of Michigan, of New York, and of Ohio can supply our markets with hops. The production of these States during the past year has exceeded 30,000,000 pounds, but if we are to allow foreigners to crowd our producers out of our own markets by reducing the duties, or making the duties ineffectual or non-productive, then our own farmers will be compelled to throw up their hands, and we shall, in this way, stimulate and augment foreign labor to the detriment of our own. The quantity of this staple imported is very small as compared with our domestic production, yet it is an injury to have so large a quantity thrown upon our markets, thereby delaying the sale possibly of the products of our own farmers. Hops must be sold when the crop is fresh, and if the market is to be glutted by Canadians it may result in great injury to our own producers. But as the Government requires revenue, although we have the right as American producers to claim the whole market, yet, on the payment of ten cents per pound duty, the farmers of the West will be satisfied; and, with this alteration, we can calculate that for the next fiscal year the revenue from this source, instead of being \$280,445, shall be at least \$500,000.

HONEY.

The duty on honey is 20 cents a gallon, and the quantity imported last year was 102,736 gallons, yielding \$20,547 revenue.

VEGETABLES.

The duty on vegetables is 10 per cent., and the quantity imported having been \$495,952, the revenue derived from this source was \$63,158. Now, I am aware that some persons contend that the vegetables produced in the gardens and on the farms of the Dominion of Canada should be admitted free of duty, but I fail to see on what ground this claim is made. These markets certainly are ours, and if they are to be supplied by Canadians, or any other foreign farmers, our own gardeners and farmers will be injured thereby. I believe the duty should be at least 20 per cent. on vegetables; and if by so doing we can check the importation, it will be as well for our own producers, and probably the Treasury will receive as much, if not more, money by imposing 20 per cent. than it now receives, while the duty is only 10 per cent. The question is, Have not our own gardeners and farmers better rights here in our own markets than foreigners? Do foreigners pay our taxes to maintain our schools and libraries? Do they pay for carrying on this Government? Have

they upon their shoulders the great debt incurred to save the Republic they have attempted twice to break down? Have we not the farmers and the gardeners in our own country who can supply our markets with vegetables? I think you, sir, will agree with me in concluding that we have. I insist, then, that if foreigners are to be permitted to sell their truck and stuff in our markets, they shall be required, before doing so, to call at the custom-house and pay the duties required by our tariff.

POTATOES.

On the 1st of August, 1872, the duty on potatoes was reduced ten cents per bushel, thereby putting into the pockets of the Canadians and the people of Bermuda 10 cents in cash on every bushel of potatoes which they have sold in our markets since that time. The revenue derived from this source in 1871, when the duty was 25 cents per bushel, was \$107,985. I have no doubt there are some gentlemen here who would be willing to have this duty removed wholly; but I have to say to such gentlemen that in so doing we will put this money into the hands of those who come from abroad to sell their potatoes in our markets. Let the duty be raised to the former rate, which was 25 cents per bushel. It can not be claimed that the price of potatoes is reduced in our markets by repealing the duty. Those who live on or near the frontier know that this is not so. The farmer from Canada, when he sells potatoes in our markets, accepts the market price, and when we exact a duty that duty must be deducted from the price in estimating the net avails of his crop. The quantity imported, you will perceive, has never exceeded 500,000 bushels, while the product of the United States is over 130,000,000 bushels per annum. I know that free-traders sometimes contend that the duties imposed by the tariff are paid by the American people, and they sometimes go even beyond that, and claim that the amount of the duty is not only added to the price simply of the quantity of the commodity imported, but that the duty has the effect to advance the price of the entire product of the United States to the full extent of the duty. And the Free-trade League have hired men to travel all over the United States to deliver lectures upon this question, paying their expenses and advertising them liberally. These men have contended, even in the city where I reside, that this is so. And while a doctor of divinity whom they had hired for such work was dilating on the enormous wrong done the American people by the tariff advancing the

prices of commodities all over the United States to the extent of the duties imposed on the quantity imported, he happened to speak of potatoes, saying, "Look at this outrageous duty the monopolists have laid of 25 cents per bushel on potatoes imported. It has the effect," he said, "to advance the price of potatoes 25 cents per bushel all over the United States." But, Mr. Speaker, it so happened that at that very time the price of potatoes in our market was only 22 cents per bushel; therefore, according to the theory advanced by this free-trade lecturer, the farmers were required to pay 3 cents per bushel to have their potatoes taken off their hands.

DRESSED HOGS.

The duty on dressed hogs is 1 cent per pound, and the amount imported was 90,214 pounds, yielding \$9,902 revenue. You will see that when the Canadian brings his hogs to our market he gets the market price for them. If the price be \$6 a hundred he obtains that price; but before he can sell them he is required to pay 1 cent per pound at the custom-house. So in returning home he carries only \$5 a hundred, while the American in the same market takes the same price, \$6 per hundred; but he, having no duty to settle, carries home the \$6 per hundred for his hogs. Do our farmers in Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa, or any other State, object to that? Are our farmers anxious that Canadians shall come over here and supply our markets, and sell their productions without paying any tax for the right to do so? Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear farmers in Missouri complain about this matter; and do you think the farmers out there would like to have the duty on dressed hogs repealed?

BEEF—BARLEY.

On beef the duty is 1 cent a pound, yielding last year \$4,575 in gold.

The duty on barley is 15 cents a bushel, yielding last year the handsome sum of \$647,661.

LIVE HOGS, HORSES, AND SHEEP.

The duty on live hogs, horses, and sheep is 20 per cent., yielding last year \$648,296.

If we remit this duty the foreign producer will go home with just that much more money. It can not be claimed that the number of these animals imported has any effect upon prices here, for the annual product of our own country is over \$1,500,000,000.

COLD BISCUIT.

The duty on cold biscuit is 20 per cent., yielding \$20,508. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] object to that? Would he have our own country-

women robbed of that amount of labor? Would he prefer cold biscuit from London to the nice hot biscuit made by the gentlewomen of Kentucky? I know some gentlemen on this floor who wear clothing made in London. And it may give them as much satisfaction to rob American tailors of that amount of labor as it may to eat the cold biscuit produced by the London bakers instead of the better home made. Nevertheless, on the \$102,542 worth of biscuit imported during the last year the Treasury received the handsome amount I have mentioned.

CORN.

The duty on corn is 10 cents per bushel, and the quantity imported was 61,539 bushels, yielding \$6,153 in gold to the Treasury. Will any one say that corn is made 10 cents per bushel dearer thereby all over the United States, as the free-traders claim? I wish it could be so; for if it would secure that result I should favor a duty of 50 cents on every bushel of imported corn. But I think it can hardly be possible for any sane man to be humbugged by such shallow talk. In some of the Western States, for lack of a market, corn upon the farm does not bring even 10 cents per bushel to the hand of the farmer. As with other commodities, so with corn; the quantity imported, being only a drop in the bucket of our supply, does not affect our prices. The crop of the United States of over 900,000,000 bushels determines the price of this staple in our own markets; and any man must be either a knave or a fool to claim that the duty on the quantity imported affects prices in the American markets. When the Canadian brings his corn here he takes our market price, and goes home with that price after deducting the duties paid.

MACCARONI AND VERMICELLI—ST. LOUIS FLOUR TO LONDON AND BACK.

In 1871 the duty on macaroni and vermicelli was 35 per cent., yielding \$29,061 revenue. By the act of June 6, 1872, the duty was repealed, and from that time the foreign producers have been benefited about \$30,000 in gold per annum. And in this way we have not only robbed the Treasury, but we have robbed our own producers of macaroni and vermicelli to that extent. I know it suits some people very well to talk of having our work done in Europe. They gladly witness Saint Louis flour shipped all the way to England; and after being handled by London bakers the same flour, in neat boxes, with bright labels, is brought back to us in the shape of London crackers, vermicelli, and Italian macaroni. Is this good for the

American working man? Is it economy? Is it wise and profitable to ship Saint Louis flour to Europe, and bring back the same flour and a large amount of labor added to it in the value of the goods I have mentioned?

OATS.

The duty on oats is 10 cents per bushel, and the quantity imported last year having been 226,297 bushels, the revenue realized was \$22,629 in gold. I think no one can dispute me when I assert that this amount of money was paid into the Treasury by foreign producers. This quantity certainly had no effect upon our prices, being less than a quarter of a million bushels, while the great product of the United States is 230,000,000 bushels. I repeat that the foreign producer, in selling commodities in our markets, accepts the market prices of our country; and when we require from him the payment of duties they are paid out of his own pocket. And in this way we replenish the Treasury of our Government; restrain foreigners from monopolizing and glutting our markets with the products of their labor; shield and protect the American people, and reserve to them the national markets for their benefit.

OATMEAL.

Oatmeal was imported during the last fiscal year amounting to 3,468,000 pounds, paying a duty of $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound, and yielding \$19,657. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have factories in this country producing the finest oatmeal in the world. We do not want our markets to be crammed with Scotch groats; we want American oatmeal, the best food known to man. If the people of other countries wish to manufacture oatmeal for our markets, we only desire that they shall either come here to do the work or call and pay 1 cent per pound for the privilege of selling foreign make in our markets.

PEAS AND BEANS.

I come now to peas and beans, which pay a duty of 10 per cent., yielding to the Treasury last year \$23,617. I find also that split peas pay a duty of 20 per cent., yielding a handsome revenue to the Treasury. We can split our own peas as well as do any other kind of work that need be done; and if foreigners want to split peas for the American market, let us split 20 per cent. out of their pockets.

FURNITURE.

I find the importation of furniture to have been \$448,543, which, at 35 per cent., yielded to the Treasury in gold \$156,990. This amount was not paid by the American people, and I think it would be wise

to charge 50 per cent. duty; but as it has been fixed at 35 per cent. I will not urge a change at the present time. We have in our country the wood, we have the material of every description, and we have the artisans and the workmen who can produce furniture suitable for any mansion in America. If foreign workers in furniture wish to sell their sofas and their tables and their chairs here, let them call at the captain's office and pay the duty of 35 per cent.

MILK.

The duty on milk is 20 per cent., and the importation having been to the value of \$28,648, the receipts into the Treasury from this source were \$5,609.

EGGS.

The duty on eggs in 1871 was 10 per cent., and the receipts into the Treasury from this source for the fiscal year ending June 30 were \$27,867. This duty was removed by the act of June 6, 1872, and the Treasury has lost that much money during the past year from this source.

WHEAT.

The duty on wheat is 20 cents per bushel, and the quantity imported during the last fiscal year having been 1,056,345 bushels, the Treasury received \$211,269 from this source. Now that amount of money was extracted from the foreign producer of wheat. It helps our Treasury, does no harm to our country, and, although our own farmers can raise wheat sufficient to supply our own market, yet we are willing, on account of the revenue which it is desirable to raise, that the Canadian shall sell wheat in our markets, provided he pays 20 cents on each bushel for the privilege of doing so. You will see that the quantity imported was a trifle over 1,000,000 bushels. The production of our country exceeds 275,000,000 bushels per annum.

When we ship wheat to England we meet there the producers of England, as well as the surplus from Germany and Russia, and we get the current price in Mark Lane, after paying all the transportation and other expenses, including the duty whenever the British Parliament levies a duty on importations of corn and wheat.

FLOUR, BRICK, AND BRUSHES.

The duty on flour 20 per cent., yielding last fiscal year \$63,522.

The duty on bricks is 20 per cent., yielding \$13,484.

The duty on brushes is 40 per cent., yielding last year \$157,279. If all these brushes had been made in America over ten thousand persons would have been supported by the labor.

CARRIAGES.

The duty on carriages is 35 per cent. While we have carriage-makers competent to produce carriages of every description and of a quality superior to that of any foreign maker, yet during the past year the value of \$71,572 was imported, yielding \$25,050 revenue.

HYDRAULIC CEMENT.

The duty on hydraulic cement is 20 per cent., and the quantity imported last year was \$209,076 yielding \$41,819 revenue. We have cement in this country of every description and of superior quality. The cement produced in Kentucky, I do not hesitate to say, is superior to any imported cement; and while we have the ability to produce this article in our own country, having abundant labor here for the purpose, I think it is desirable to charge foreigners 20 per cent. on the amount imported.

GLUE, CIDER, AND WATCHES.

The duty on glue is 20 per cent., yielding \$36,514 revenue.

The duty on cider is 20 per cent., and the duty on watches is 20 per cent., yielding during the last fiscal year, \$787,671 revenue. If the duty on foreign watches was fixed at 50 per cent. it would cause the great factories of Europe to be transferred to our Western States, and in less than ten years the smoke of this industry would rise from many towns and villages in the West.

CLOTHING.

The value of imported clothing last year was \$1,618,945, yielding \$706,802 revenue to the Treasury. If this large amount of work had been reserved for our people many thousands would have obtained employment here, augmenting our labor, swelling the national wealth, and promoting the prosperity of the country. Give to the people the nation's work and we should have no poor-houses; for when the people find work they can support themselves without charity and without public work-houses.

CLOVER-SEED.

The duty on clover-seed is 20 per cent., yielding during the last year \$55,844 revenue. This amount of revenue was contributed toward the support of our Government by the Canadian producers. They sell their clover-seed in our market and realize the market rate, after deducting the amount of duty paid, while the American sells clover-seed in the same market and drives home to his farm with the whole market price in his pocket.

COAL—A PLOT TO ROB THE TREASURY. AND THROW OUR MINERS OUT OF WORK.

By the act of June 6, 1872, the duty on

coal was reduced to 75 cents per ton; and during the past fiscal year 411,039 tons having been imported, the amount of revenue realized was only \$308,279; while under the former duty of \$1 25 per ton, in 1871, the revenue realized on 430,508 tons, was \$538,135. In 1872, 485,063 tons were imported, paying a duty of \$1 25 per ton, and yielding \$606,329 in revenue. Therefore it will be seen that in reducing the duty 50 cents per ton we have reduced the revenue about one-half; and in so doing have put about \$300,000 into the pockets of the people of Pictou and Cape Breton during the past year. This is the reason of so much cheerfulness in that country at this time, and accounts for the great rejoicing which occurred in Canada when the duty on coal was reduced 50 cents per ton. They sell no more coal in our markets than they did prior to the time the reduction took effect; but now they realize the full amount of that reduction when they ship coal to our ports. As I have said before, in legislating the tariff down we have legislated money into the hands of foreign producers. We have robbed our Treasury of a large amount of revenue, and we have encouraged labor in foreign lands instead of supporting working men here at home. The price of coal was not reduced by the reduction of the duty. The price in the Boston market before and after the time the reduction took effect remained the same; but as soon as the reduction went into operation the Blue Noses of Nova Scotia went home with 50 cents a ton more money.

CONGRESS SHOULD PROTECT THE PEOPLE OF THE COUNTRY AGAINST THE LABOR OF ALL OTHERS—COAL ABUNDANT IN THE UNITED STATES.

We are here, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, to legislate for the benefit of the American people, and I fail to perceive how we are faithfully discharging our duty when we reduce the tariff, and in so doing snatch labor out of the hands of our working men, take money out of the Treasury of our Government, and lodge it in the pockets of foreigners. According to the statement of the Bureau of Education, we tax ourselves voluntarily in this country to the amount of \$95,402,726 per annum for public libraries and for the public education of the young. Is it right to ask a people who are willing to submit to this large tax for the benefit of the rising generation, and for the future safety of the Republic, to allow foreigners to come in here and take possession of our markets, and sell the products of their labor without paying the tariff tax at the Treasury

of our Government? Should foreign wars break upon us as they have in the past, can we require the coal-heavers of Cape Breton and Pictou to come here and fight our battles? Can we draft them to fill up the ranks our depleted armies? Are we so interested in our foreign cousins that we can submit to this wrong which the American people would be compelled to suffer if we reduced the duties on imports? People who are acquainted with the business know that the price of coal in our markets is never affected by the duties imposed on foreign coal. It is only the ignorant, or the middlemen, and the Shylocks of trade, interested in foreign products and interested in the handling of such products in our markets, that attempt to poison the minds of the Western people with the foolish notion that the American people pay these duties. They know that this is not so; they know that it is mischievous and shameful lying, and that they themselves are the only interested ones in a reduction of these duties. Here in our great importing cities the unfriendly Modocs may be found. They would willingly scalp American labor, and paralyze our industries, that they might take free and unrestricted possession of our markets. Now, the quantity of coal imported in any year would not supply a single industry in my State. The supply of coal in the United States is inexhaustible. Missouri alone has over 20,000 square miles of coal, and Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and scores of other States possess inexhaustible deposits. The miners working in our coal mines in the West, as well as at the East, can supply our markets with coal without the aid of foreign production, and they know, too, that if the demand for coal in any of our markets is supplied even in part by foreign labor, our miners will get that much less work here.

COPPER.

Copper pays a duty of 5 cents per pound, yielding the past year \$436,363. Our mines are inexhaustible, and the revenue from duty on copper is so much clear gain to the Treasury. From 1857 to 1861 copper was admitted free of duty. The Treasury got no revenue from it, and the prices of copper in our markets were higher than they are to day.

FISH—CANADIAN FISHERMEN WANT OUR MARKETS.

Before the 1st of July, 1873, foreign fish were subject to duty. I find that the importation of herring for the year ending June 30, 1873, was 63,497 barrels, duty \$1 per barrel, yielding \$63,497. Mackerel paid a duty of \$2 per barrel,

and yielded \$141,302 revenue. The duty on salmon was \$3 per barrel, and the duty on other fish was \$1 50 per barrel. The total duty realized on fish imported was \$251,008. This amount of money swelled the coffers of the Treasury, and prior to the 1st of July last was paid by foreign fishermen for the privilege of selling their fish in our markets. Unfortunately by the treaty of Washington this duty on all fish the product of the sea was removed on the 1st of July last; and from that time the Canadian fisherman sells his fish in our ports, and sails home with that price in his pocket. Prior to that time he was required to pay duties at the custom-house before he could get a permit to sell; therefore by the treaty of Washington the Treasury will lose at least \$250,000 per annum, and the American fishermen on the seacoast will suffer the annoyance and the inconvenience of an excessive supply of Canadian fish in his market, to his serious injury and loss. With reference to the price of fish I will here refer, in order to make the case plain, to the *New York Mercantile Journal* of June 26, 1873, which quotes the various descriptions of fish in that market; and the same journal, on the 3d of July, which was after the treaty took effect, quotes mackerel and other kinds of fish at the same prices. By this it will be seen that the removal of the duties from fish, which took effect on the 1st of July, 1873, had no effect on the prices, and that by the repeal of the duties on foreign fish we reduced the revenues of our Treasury, and gave more money to the foreigners who bring fish to sell in our markets; and on this account last July the fires of joy lit up the evening skies on the Bay of Chaleur and all along the Canadian coasts. Happily the fish of our lakes and rivers were not embraced in the article in relation to fish in the treaty of Washington; but by a recent act of Congress the duties on fresh white fish and fish for bait were repealed. You will find, sir, by referring to my bill, that I have not omitted to include fish of all kinds, making the duty $\frac{1}{2}$ cent per pound after the 1st of July next. I think our people prefer to fish as well as cut bait for supplying our markets with fresh fish.

IRON AND IRON WORKERS.

The duty on pig-iron is \$7 per ton, less 10 per cent., and the quantity imported last year was 207,000 tons, yielding \$1,261,349 revenue. Now the production of pig-iron in the United States is near 3,000,000 tons. The quantity imported, therefore, can not affect our prices to consumers; but the importation lodges

a vast amount of revenue in our Treasury. The iron-ore product of the mines of Michigan last year was over 1,250,000 tons. You will perceive by this that the importation of only 207,000 tons of pig is an insignificant quantity compared with the vast production of our own mines and furnaces. And when the duty on pig-iron was reduced from \$9 to \$7, which took effect on the 1st of January, 1871, the price of pig-iron in our market continued the same; but the price on the other side of the Atlantic went up \$2 per ton. So, in reducing the duty on pig-iron, we took that much money out of the Treasury, amounting in a single year to over \$400,000; and that large amount inured to the benefit and profit of foreigners. It stuck to the fingers of the bloated capitalists and monopolists of England.

LUMBER.

The foreign lumber imported during the last fiscal year yielded \$1,483,799 revenue. The quantity imported altogether is not equal to the sales in one of our western cities in a single year. Nevertheless, a large revenue is realized from this source; and it might be increased, by advancing the duty, to the benefit of the Treasury and American producers. The value of the annual product of lumber in the United States is estimated to be \$1,500,000,000.

THE CHICAGO FIRE AND THE CHICAGO RELIEF ACT.

In 1872 petitions were presented here for the repeal of duties on building material, and at that time many ignorant persons had a notion that our supply of building material was largely drawn from foreign countries; and soon after the Chicago fire Congress provided that in rebuilding that city a drawback should be granted to the extent of the duty on all imported building material.

And, sir, what was the result of that generous act? Now, deducting the plate-glass, the total amount of drawback realized by the people of Chicago on all imported material was only \$16,869—not so much as the expense of the two Houses of Congress for the time consumed in the consideration of the measure. It was called the "Chicago relief bill," and no doubt many persons supposed this act of Congress would aid that fire-stricken city to the extent of many millions of dollars. And, sir, I only refer to this for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that American producers furnish more than nineteen-twentieths of the commodities required to supply all domestic demands in the United States.

DOMESTIC PRODUCTIONS IN GENERAL USE.

You might travel, sir, for months through our factories and upon our farms without seeing a single tool or implement of foreign make, and you will rarely, if ever, find any of the imported fabrics or finery in the homes of our industrious people; you will find the productions of American looms and American factories in common use all over the United States.

AMERICAN FREE-TRADERS—BRITISH BODKINS.

But, sir, we have a few British bodkins in America, and you have heard our free-trade orators dilate on the advantage to working men of a residence in Europe; and, although they admit that the wages of labor are less than one-half the compensation realized in this country, yet they say the laborer with the wages in Europe can buy more tools and blankets than he can obtain here for the same money.

The point might be good if the laborer had no food to buy, if he could live on *air* or *free-trade* sentiment; but inasmuch as a chest of tools or a pair of blankets will last half a century, the laborer is not required very often to buy such things. His daily necessities for food require the largest part of his earnings, and therefore this central idea in the free-trade argument disappears like the fiction of a dream. Aside from the daily cost of food, the expenditures for other necessities of life are only occasional and comparatively insignificant.

Why, sir, I have blankets that cover my own children that were woven by my grandmother, and they are better to-day than the blankets produced in the shoddy factories of England.

THE COST OF FOOD THE CHIEF EXPENSE OF LIVING—THE SUPERIOR CONDITION OF AMERICAN WORKING MEN—IMMIGRATION.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in point of fact, over seven-eighths of the total expenditures for living of a large majority of the American people is required for subsistence alone, and as food is cheaper here than in any country of Europe, even admitting, for illustration, that the price of some manufactured articles is higher in this country at the present time, yet the working man, realizing double compensation for his labor, can afford to pay higher prices for the remaining one-eighth part of his disbursements, and make money by emigrating to the United States. And, sir, I think the intelligent and practical laboring people of Europe understand this matter

far better than our theoretical political economists of the free-trade school, for during the past year about four hundred thousand emigrants have arrived here from Great Britain and the Continent of Europe—those countries where the working man has limited opportunities for improving his condition, and few chances for lifting himself out of the bondage of poverty, a condition of dependence which differs only in name from chattel slavery.

SALT—FREE LABOR vs. SLAVES AND PAUPERS.

The revenue derived from imported salt in 1872 was \$1,083,505. But on the 1st of August, 1872, a reduction of about 33 per cent. was made in the duty, resulting in a large reduction of the revenue from this source during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1873, being only \$742,395. This reduction gave great satisfaction, and occasioned great rejoicing in foreign countries. It should be borne in mind that salt may be found in nearly every State in the Union. The material from which it is produced is not considered of any value, and a barrel of salt as seen in our markets is nothing more nor less than a barrel of labor. I can take you to the State of Michigan, where salt is found in great abundance, and the people there will give you acres of land if you will only establish salt works. In Louisiana I saw pure, solid rock-salt in inexhaustible quantity. Nearly all the States of the West produce salt, and the supply for the American market should be obtained from our own country. We now produce more than three-fourths of all the salt we consume, and as the price of salt is fixed by the law of supply and demand, the foreigner gets the American price, after deducting the duties required to be paid.

WE HAVE NO STATUTES OR TREATIES FIXING PRICES—THEY ARE FIXED BY THE NATURAL LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

As I said before, there are no laws fixing prices. The prices of commodities are as changeable as the sands of the sea. If we remit the duty, the foreigner would get that much more for his salt. Although a large reduction occurred on the 1st of August, 1872, yet, as will be seen by the report of the Bureau of Statistics, the prices of salt in our markets were not affected thereby. It is interesting to notice the changes that have occurred in the production of American salt since the great tariff act of 1862. The importation of salt for 1860 was 14,000,000 bushels, yielding only \$214,000 revenue. This was under a free-trade or "revenue-re-

form" tariff. In 1871, under the highest rates of duty, the importation was only about 9,000,000, but yielding \$1,176,587 revenue. The quantity was 5,000,000 less than the importation under the free-trade tariff above mentioned, yet under the protective tariff we obtained over \$900,000 more revenue. It is interesting also to note that since 1860 we have more than doubled the production of salt in this country, and in this single industry employment is given to over 50,000 men. Before the tariff act of 1861 our manufacturers were unable to supply the markets of the seaboard with a single bushel, but in 1871 over 2,000,000 bushels of domestic salt was sold in the city of New York. The \$1,176,587 in gold which foreigners, in 1871, were required to pay into the Treasury for the privilege of selling their salt in our markets causes the shoes of foreign producers to pinch, and the Spaniard driving his slaves and the Englishmen working paupers in Liverpool are anxious that the tariff should be repealed. I am not surprised that they hire people to come over here to give us good advice, and try to produce a change in our tariff laws to suit themselves, under the name of "revenue reform."

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAYNARD. I hope the gentleman will be allowed to proceed and conclude his remarks, for he is certainly instructing us very handsomely.

No objection was made, and leave was accordingly granted.

Mr. FIELD. Now I take the ground that salt is not affected in price by the quantity imported. Ohio alone produces over 8,000,000 bushels of salt, and Michigan produces not less, and prices to-day in our markets are less than they were in 1860, when we imported nearly all we consumed in the United States, and when we were entirely dependent on foreigners for our supply.

WOOL AND THE RIGHTS OF OUR WOOL-GROWERS.

The duty on raw wool and the manufactures of wool for the last fiscal year was \$38,496,628. The duty on wool is about 10 cents per pound. The quantity of wool imported does not materially affect prices in our markets, as our farmers produce over 177,000,000 pounds. And if the half-naked herdsmen of South America wish to compete with our farmers in selling wool in our markets we only require them to walk up and settle the regular duty at the custom-house. The duty comes out of the foreign producer, the people of La Plata

and Buenos Ayres and other places, who wish to sell their wool in the American markets.

Should the duty be repealed the effect would be to crush our own wool-growers, for the influx of foreign wool would glut and spoil our home markets, and the home market is the chief if not the only support to the wool-grower, as well as labor in any other department of industry.

OTHER MANUFACTURES IMPORTED YIELDING A LARGE REVENUE.

The value of wools and woolen goods imported during the last fiscal year was \$72,692,742, yielding \$38,490,623 revenue; the value of iron and steel goods was \$57,333,157, yielding \$18,237,388 revenue; and the value of cotton manufactures was \$31,810,680, yielding \$11,557,173 revenue; the value of leather was \$11,812,147, yielding \$3,734,828 revenue; the value of flax goods was \$21,724,807, yielding \$7,212,791 revenue; the value of hemp goods was \$7,862,441, yielding \$1,648,089 revenue; the value of lead goods was \$3,413,393, yielding \$1,365,848 revenue. The aggregate revenue derived from the above eight classes of commodities was \$82,246,752. As I have already shown with reference to other staples, so, in like manner, the foreign producer of these goods pays the duty required by the tariff into the Treasury of the United States. If we remit these duties, or any part of the duty, we shall lodge the amount in the hands of the foreign producer, making a heavy loss to our Treasury, and doing our working men an irreparable injury. We possess the raw material, the machinery, and the artisans capable of producing all these commodities, and when we allow foreigners to bring their goods into our markets it is right and proper that we should levy protective duties upon them for the encouragement of our home manufactures, and for the purpose of enlarging and diversifying our industries.

THE SHOEMAKERS OF NEW ENGLAND.

Some short-sighted shoemakers in New England want the duties on leather repealed. They are so blind that they do not see that the price of leather would not be reduced by a reduction of the duties, and they forget that for fifty years a duty of \$1 50 was levied on every pair of boots imported into the United States. Under protection, and by the aid of skill and machinery, their industries have reached a point of perfection to defy foreign competition. Prices have been so reduced by domestic competition that even without a tariff foreigners could not sell much of their work in our markets; but, notwithstanding this his-

torical tariff fact before them, we now hear these shoemakers raising their voices against our tanners. They want to kill off our tanners for the temporary benefit which they imagine would accrue to them. They forget that by striking down even *one* home industry so great as that of the leather manufacturers would cripple all others, and paralyze and destroy the prosperity of the country, and consequently the shoemakers would suffer as well as all others by the general calamity.

THE DESTRUCTION OF INDUSTRY THE DESTRUCTION OF WEALTH.

You remember, sir, the destruction of the city of Chicago by fire. It was a national calamity, on account of the vast destruction of wealth, and the injurious effects of the great loss were felt far and near; but, sir, this calamity, affecting as it did so many thousands of our people, was a mere bagatelle compared to the destruction of a great home industry, producing in a single year more than twenty times the wealth that was destroyed when Chicago burned. The shoemakers should understand that the industries are dependent; their interests are mutual, and an injury to one is quickly felt by another. If you saw off a man's leg the whole body is injured and its successful working impaired; and so it is with the whole body or association of industries—the co-operation of each is essential to the well-being of all. They should remember that the permanent success of one industry is only assured by the prosperity of all. All efforts, therefore, on the part of one trade or industry to assail and injure another are supremely mean and selfish.

A SELFISH DISPOSITION.

I have, Mr. Speaker, some fine Essex pigs on my farm; they are undoubtedly as well-bred as pigs can be, but I have often seen one pig try to root another out of the trough. So it is with the consumers of leather, and the consumers of steel, in fighting the leather and steel manufactures of the United States. They display a disposition of hoggish meanness, only deserving the contempt and disgust of all fair-minded men. The New England shoemakers have enjoyed the blessing of protection for more than half a century. If all manufacturing industries shall continue to be protected in this country for half that time we shall see a greater number of industries established on the fertile prairies of the West than we now find in operation on the sterile rocks of New England, for "westward the course of empire takes its way;" and the industries, the graceful companions of our civilization, are

now taking their congenial and profitable places in all the villages and cities of the West.

INDEPENDENCE FOR THE MASSES—RESERVE THE NATIONAL MARKETS TO THE NATIONAL LABOR.

This Government was organized in behalf of independent labor. It is a working men's country, and they control and regulate its affairs by the ballot; and the question returns, Shall we legislate here to benefit and bless the American people, or for the benefit and for the advantage of foreign nations? The country is ours, the markets of the country belong to us, and the people have a right to demand of their representatives here that the markets of the country shall be reserved for the benefit of the American people. I do not fail, however, to consider that the Treasury of the Government requires revenue, and, notwithstanding it is great injury to our labor to tolerate the importation of manufactures which we have the ability to produce here, we are willing to submit to this injury and to this damage in order to secure to the Treasury the means of carrying on the Government. If the Treasury required no revenue from such sources, I should insist upon it as a representative of the American people that not one dollar's worth of imported manufactures which we have the ability to produce here should be admitted into the country. On all products which we can not successfully and conveniently produce we are willing they should be admitted free; but on all other products the rights and the interests of the American people require that if we allow them to enter at all we should require protective duties, and by so doing encourage home industry, secure to our people a diversity of pursuits and abundance of employments, which will enable them to secure better rewards for toil, and lift them out of a condition of helplessness to that of independence and wealth. The working man has labor to sell; it is his capital and dependence for support, and whoever proposes to destroy his employment, reduce his work, or cut down his wages must be looked upon as an enemy to his vital interests.

THE FOLLY AND INJUSTICE OF HIRING LABOR IN EUROPE TO DO OUR MECHANICAL WORK WHILE AMERICANS NEED EMPLOYMENT.

The commodities imported during the past fiscal year consisted almost wholly of manufactures which can be successfully produced in the United States. The total amount of imports, as may be seen by the report of the Bureau of Statistics, was \$684,633,735. Deducting

from this amount the tea, coffee, and some other articles not produced in this country, we find the value of the other products imported to be \$484,746,861. These manufactures and productions compete directly with our home labor, as we are producing like commodities in the United States, and to produce that amount furnished employment to at least 1,200,000 hands, embracing the work of over 500 distinct trades and occupations. You will perceive, therefore, that notwithstanding the impediments and restraints of the existing tariff the capitalists and manufacturers of other countries sent over during the past year this vast amount of their mechanical work, consisting mainly of leather, furniture, cigars, machinery, saws, edge-tools, iron and steel manufactures of every description, clothing, cotton and woolen goods, and other goods, all of which ought to be manufactured here at home, as we possess the raw material as well as the skill and machinery to perform the work.

THE FARMER'S QUESTION—THE GREAT OUTLET FOR FOOD.

If all these commodities consumed by our market had been manufactured in the United States, over 1,200,000 hands would have been employed here, to the manifest advantage of our working men, increasing the demands for labor, and securing a better, near-by market to the farmer.

But I desire now to call the attention of the House and of the country to the fact that this large number of laborers consumed more food than our total exports of breadstuffs and provisions to foreign countries during the same time. And if this large number were engaged in factories and workshops in this country, turning out the same mechanical work which we import, they would consume this food in our own country. About 30 per cent. of the value of manufactured commodities may be estimated as the food consumed by the laborers while at work in their production, and I desire the members from the West and the South and the Southwest to consider the importance of seeking this, the greatest of all outlets for their surplus food. We need the factory and the farm to be placed side by side, and thus we shall secure strength and wealth for both. We have had conventions at the West and at the South seeking to provide outlets for food; and I have heard gentlemen make long speeches on the importance of providing foreign outlets for our food. I would have them consider the importance of seeking that greatest of all outlets—the consumers of the food, the men who do our mechanical work in

Europe, brought out and lodged near by these farms, and in this way secure to our country a greater degree of happiness, a larger amount of wealth, and thus make the desert and the waste places blossom and bloom as the rose.

Herein may be found a solution in a philosophical and practical mode for the difficult "transportation question"—the bringing of the producer and consumer near together, and thus removing the necessity for the expensive and needless movement to and fro of bulky and heavy commodities.

LABOR IS WEALTH; WHEN IN EXERCISE GAIN; WHEN UNEMPLOYED A DREADFUL LOSS.

Labor is the only source of wealth. And when the labor of our country is in full exercise the accumulations are very great. But, on the other hand, every day's work lost is a dead loss to the working man. Every idle day is a loss which he can never recover, and a loss of fifty-three days' work by the workers of America would be a loss equal to the national debt. The debt, too, must be worked out; it can not be settled by any device or trick, nor by legerdemain; it is a matter of work, and it seems to be a matter of the highest importance to foster, encourage, and stimulate the labor of the nation.

THE GREAT NEED OF THE WEST AND SOUTH.

The great need of the country to-day in the West and South is a diversity of employments. They require more factories, more mechanical works, and the farmers are beginning to see this. You will find in any county of any of the Western States that the farmers are quite willing to contribute, by subscription and by subsidies, in establishing factories in their midst. The watch factory at Elgin, Ill., is a greater benefit to that State than all her trade with a country like France. I have a farm in Iowa; it is good land, as rich in soil as any in that State, and well situated, yet I will give two-thirds of it to any man who will establish a factory near by.

THE FARM AND THE FACTORY CLOSE TOGETHER.

The farmer wants a market not only for wheat and corn, but for all the other products of the soil, the dairy, and the farm; and to secure that condition he must secure a near-by market, and to sustain such a market mechanical manufactures are required. The importance of this question can not be overestimated, and in its discussion we must bear in mind that over nineteen-twentieths of the people of this country depend on labor for maintenance and happiness.

The national Legislature, therefore, should so frame the laws of the country that the dignity and the independence of working men may be maintained, and the greatest good to the greatest number assured; for it is for the happiness and prosperity of a majority of the people that this popular Government was organized.

THE IMPORTATION OF FOOD IN MANUFACTURES—THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES THE LARGEST IMPORTERS OF FOOD IN THE WORLD.

I wish to place before our farmers and gardeners the fact that when we import manufactures we import food, as food is one of the largest items in the cost of producing manufactures, and during the past year we have imported more food in that shape than we have ever exported in a single year, and thus the people of the United States, notwithstanding all our boasting, are the largest importers of food in the world. You can not make goods without men eat bread, and about 30 per cent. of the cost of manufactures is expended for food. In every ton of pig-iron there is at least \$11 60 worth of food. The English free-traders want to tickle our vanity, and they say, "The United States is the granary of the world." They wish to make our farmers believe that it would be profitable and well for them to raise grain for shipment to England, losing six bushels in every seven in the cost of transportation, and bring back the same food in the shape of manufactures, together with a much larger amount produced on the farms of Russia, Germany, and England.

OUR FARMERS AND GARDENERS.

Our farmers and gardeners are faithful toilers from early dawn till late at dewy eve. I know their difficulties and vexations at times are great. They often suffer from the injury and devastations of the insect, the drought, the floods, and the frosts; yet they can overcome all these impediments and losses; but should they be compelled also to face the blighting and destroying effects of free trade they would be forced to abandon the field and throw up their hands in despair. Without customers and without any demand for his products, the farmer would fill up his corn-crib only to see his crop rot; and his cabbages, turnips, and potatoes would waste ungathered for want of a market. He could shovel his grain into the fire, and bake his meat over the burning corn, as we have seen on the western prairies in free-trade times. His old customers, forced out of employment in the workshops, now cultivate the soil too, and

both farmer and mechanic languish and fall together.

THE FREE-TRADE SWINDLE AND THE GRANGERS OF THE WEST.

The farmers and the gardeners will puncture this bubble, for they must, I think, see through this swindling free-trade scheme at a glance. The mechanics of a single manufacturing city I can name consume more of our farm productions than our foreign customers ever take. Double the number of mechanics in this country to-morrow, and you would double the value of the lands of our farmers and gardeners, and the prices of farm products would bring to them a better reward for their toil. On the other hand, strike down home manufactures, throw the operatives out of employment, let all the mechanical work they are now doing be done in England and elsewhere, and let population fall off, as it would, one-half, what would the gardener's land be worth, and what prices would farm products fetch in a community stricken with paralysis and pauperism?

Why, I ask, is it that the business of farming in the State of New Jersey, or Pennsylvania, or Michigan, is more profitable than in the far-off States of the West? The reason is, that the farm and the factory lie side by side, and the one furnishes a profitable and desirable customer for the other. Let the mechanical work which we are now employing England and other countries to do be performed in the States of the West and of the South, and we shall not have the large surplus of food to be shipped to the other end of the world in search of a market.

MONOPOLIES IN GENERAL AND PARTICULAR.

I have heard some gentlemen remark that by imposing taxation on the products of foreign labor we encourage monopolies in this country; but I fail to see how monopolies are built up in this way, as there are no restrictions to labor, and I know of no industrial monopoly in our country. The channels of labor and trade are open and free to all; a fair field and no favor is the practice everywhere. The success of one man stimulates others to embark in the same industry, and every additional factory and workshop increases the demand for labor, and the pleasant sounds of industry will soon be heard in every village and hamlet of the country. It might be said with as much reason that one man monopolizes the air because he may be able to breathe more of the air than another. So it is with music or anything else; one man may appreciate

and enjoy more than another, but there is no monopoly. All have the right to embark in industrial enterprises in this country, and the tariff taxation on foreign products only prevents our industries being swept away; it prevents raids upon our markets, and has a tendency to secure to our own industries stability and the support of the home markets of our country.

THE PEOPLE'S MONOPOLY OF AMERICAN WORK.

Mr. Speaker, I have always been opposed, and I am to-day opposed, to all monopolies save one. I am opposed to the national banking monopoly, because it is a benefit to a few; and I am opposed to other monopolies which have been created by legislation, and which are injurious to the best interests of the country. But sir, there is one monopoly which I favor, and which I stand here to defend and sustain, and that is the people's monopoly of American work. I hope to see the day when the American people may be able to monopolize the whole labor of our great country. This monopoly will benefit the toiling millions, for over nineteen-twentieths of our population are laboring people. And, sir, as we are here to legislate for the greatest good to the greatest number, I think no one will assert that we fail to do our duty if we, by tariff legislation, encourage the industries of our own country, and secure to the working men and the working women of the land, so far as possible, the complete monopoly of the nation's labor. English statesmen are statesmen for England; they watch and guard well the interests of British subjects. May God raise up in our own country statesmen who shall be statesmen for America. Let us guard well the interests of our own people; other nations may guard and care for their own.

THE HOME MARKET A BOON TO PRODUCERS—IMPORTING MECHANICAL WORK GLUTS OUR MARKET AND ROBS OUR PEOPLE OF THEIR LABOR.

It is the markets of the country that sustain labor, they are the priceless boon of our producers; and when these markets become glutted and overstocked the wheels of our machinery begin to move more slowly; and when the market utterly fails the work stops, and the employer and employee go out of the factory together. Destroy our home markets and you knock the bottom out of domestic employments.

You take my house, when you do take the prop that doth sustain my house: you take my life, When you do take the means whereby I live.

The markets of our country require a

certain supply of products to meet all demands, and if we allow foreigners to supply those markets one-half, then our own people can only do the other half of the work. Every day's work of imported manufactures practically robs our people of that amount of labor. Therefore the more we protect them and shield our markets from foreign invasion, the more we sustain labor here and secure prosperity for our beloved country.

CIGARS.

Now, a few years ago we had free trade in cigars, and at that time the Spaniards, driving slaves in Cuba, made our cigars, and the cigar factory was almost unknown in this country; but under the protective tariff of 1862 this industry has been shielded as against the work of slaves, and cigar factories may be found to-day in every village and every city of the country. In my district the cigar makers consume the food produced on the farms of many townships around Detroit. Here is the solution of the statement that a gardener near a great market can lay up more money off five acres than the farmer in Iowa, situated hundreds of miles from market, can accumulate on five hundred acres.

OUR UNEQUALLED FACILITIES FOR MANUFACTURES—RAW MATERIAL AND OTHER ADVANTAGES.

We have heard it said that some countries have natural advantages, and that they have extraordinary facilities for the production of manufactures. But with reference to the United States, we have a variety of soils, varied climate, and raw materials—all those conditions required to sustain the life and independence of a great nation. We possess unequalled facilities for the production of all those commodities which civilized life requires; and the only question which remains is, Shall the American people do their own work? Is it wise for us to hire foreigners to do our mechanical work, and grab this labor out of the hands of our own people; or is it not wiser and more statesmanlike for us to stand by our countrymen, and give to them the labor required to supply the needs of our countrymen for every description of work?

BUY WHERE YOU CAN—BUY THE CHEAPEST.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard gentlemen say that it is desirable for people to buy where they can buy cheapest. I would have our people buy where they can buy cheapest in our own country. And with reference to foreign countries, my notion is that in buying our mechanical work abroad, no matter what the price

may be, it is dear. If we are to hire people in foreign countries to do our work, I say it is not cheap; on the contrary it is dear. We pay dearly for what we buy abroad, because we rob our own countrymen of that amount of labor and we send away the treasure to pay the mechanics doing the work there. Domestic competition is the best leveler of prices, and if they are to be reduced let the reduction come, not by excessive importations of the products of foreign labor, nor by cutting down wages in the United States, but rather let it come by improved mechanism, new methods, new inventions, and new processes in manufacture by the aid of science and the employment of machinery. This is a "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people;" and Congress is like the head of a family with 40,000,000 children; and it is our duty and our interest to give the work of our country to the children of the country. No other country possesses superior facilities to ours; and our artisans and mechanics can do as much work, if not more, in a day than foreigners.

NOT CHEAP TO HIRE PEOPLE IN EUROPE TO DO OUR MECHANICAL WORK—A PLOT TO ROB US OF OUR MECHANICAL WORK.

If we are to go to Europe, if we are to be dependent, and beg to have our work done there, sir, you may think it is cheap, but it is a dear and exhaustive operation, and will cost more in the long run than you have calculated. England has been able for many years to pit her skill and machinery against our raw materials and rude labor. She wishes us to get out red cedar logs for shipment to England, and buy back lead-pencils. She will buy our corn and give us back poplins; she will take our rags and give us back embossed paper; she will take our square timber and give us back silk stockings and spool thread; she will take our raw cotton and give us back thimbles and hair-pins; she will take our bones and send back superphosphates; she will take our tar and turpentine and give us gravy and plum pudding; she will take our "whole skins for a sixpence and sell us back the tails for a shilling." Such trade is exhaustive and weakening. It secures to them "the workshops of the world," and to us that other rude work fit only for barbarians and slaves, the raising of raw products for distant and unfavorable markets. England is the great blood sucker of the world; she has sucked the very life out of Ireland, Turkey, India, Spain, and Canada, and now she proposes to draw upon the United States. But the plot

to rob us of our mechanical work will be exposed; and a brave, intelligent, and free people will spring to their feet in defense of their industries, as they would in defense of the flag should foreign foes invade our soil. We shall resist at all hazards every effort of British hirelings to befog and beguile the people of this country with their free-trade heresies.

RUDE WORK VS. MECHANICAL WORK— BARBARISM VS. CIVILIZATION.

If we are to do rude work, which is labor begging at forty or sixty cents per day, England will do the mechanical work, and thus employ her artisans and mechanics. If our work is to be done in England, what are we to do here? Are we to be ornamental figure-heads and wall-flowers, raise our crops, and build large poor-houses? God forbid.

EXPORTING RAW PRODUCTS—IMPORT- ING MECHANICAL AND MACHINERY WORK.

Mr. Speaker, if you examine the tables reported by the Bureau of Statistics you will find that while 76 per cent. of our imports consist of mechanical work our exports consist almost wholly of raw products, and 89 per cent. of the value of the products exported last year you will find to consist of raw cotton, food, and gold. The value of raw cotton exported was \$225,000,000. Now I would change this trade, and instead of exporting so much raw cotton I would reduce it to yarn, thereby doubling its value, and I would sell cotton yarn to foreigners at double the price of raw cotton, the difference being the value of the labor employed for the purpose. Instead of shipping one bale of raw cotton and bringing back three bales in the shape of cotton stockings and spool thread, I would work up the raw cotton on the spot and sell the manufactures of cotton, and thus augment home productions. In this way I would rehabilitate the South and furnish employment to its surplus labor, to the manifest advantage and profit of the great cotton States.

THE EIGHT-HOUR SYSTEM.

I have wished for many years to see labor elevated in my country by securing greater demands for labor, and thus bestow upon laboring men the power to fix better terms, better rewards for toil, greater independence, greater wealth, greater freedom, and less hours for toil. And I hope to see the day when, by a diversification of our pursuits and an increased demand for labor in our country, our intelligent mechanics may be

able to secure such compensation for their toil as will enable them to support themselves and their families on eight hours' work. But that day can not be hastened by giving the nation's work to the people of other countries, for labor is subject to the law of supply and demand. You can not make the Detroit river flow up stream, nor can you put up the price of wages by a vote of the union if there be no demand for labor to justify and sustain it. The more work we have to do in this country the more demand will be raised for labor here, and the greater ability on the part of the working man to make better terms and better prices for his toil.

THE CONCLUSION—PROTECTION BENEFIT- CENT, ASSURING WEALTH AND FREE- DOM TO MAN.

I take the ground that the American people are entitled to a preferential chance in their own markets; and is it not just that the people who own the country and work to build it up should enjoy the benefits of the markets which their industry and enterprise alone have created? If foreigners want access to our ports for the sale of their manufactures, let us require toll of them in the shape of protective duties, or let them come here with their capital and machinery, build factories, furnish employment to our people, and pay American wages. A protective tariff restrains and checks importation, prevents certain raids upon our markets, and when the European manufacturers find that they can not dispose of their goods without the payment of duties they will come to the United States with their capital, and pay taxes to support our schools, as we have always done. And this tendency has been exhibited in the fact that during the past twelve years thousands have arrived and put up great workshops and factories in the United States. There is, therefore, no hidden mystery about the tariff question; it is a question of dollars and cents; it is a question of labor, a just reward for labor, and independence for the masses. It favors domestic competition as against foreign monopoly; it is opposed to a reduction of labor at home, which always leads to idleness, pauperism, and crime. Protection, in short, secures to the people of this country universal prosperity, a prosperity which falls like the dews of Heaven, a good to all and an injury to none. I therefore favor, Mr. Speaker, that system of national exchanges which will put more revenue into the Treasury of our Government and more labor into the hands of the American people.

INTRODUCTION.

WE submit the *First Number* of the LAW MAGAZINE to the profession. The present issue, it will be seen, consists of about ninety pages of reading matter. It is the intention that each succeeding issue shall contain about the same number of pages—some containing, perhaps, a few pages more, and some a few pages less—depending principally on the number and length of the decisions of the Supreme Court. Our plan is to publish all the decisions of the Supreme Court, commencing with the October Term last past, with a syllabus to each case, and in such a manner that they may be readily separated from the rest of the Magazine, if subscribers should so desire. Thus the Magazine will consist of two distinct portions—the first part being composed of original essays on some subject connected with the law, important decisions of the courts of Nevada, Oregon, and other States; of the Supreme, Circuit and District Courts of the United States; abstracts of recent important decisions of English and American Courts; notes on judicial decisions; reviews and notices of law books, &c.—and the second part being composed exclusively of decisions of the Supreme Court of this State, with appropriate notes. It is believed that, in this way, the decisions of our Supreme Court can be furnished to the profession not only earlier in point of time, but in a more valuable and readable shape, than they can otherwise be procured.

Our arrangements are full and complete for the publication of the Magazine for at least one year. It will be issued on the first day of every month; and although we are a little behind the mark this time,—owing to a present scarcity of paper in the market, and other delays incident to a first issue,—neither subscribers nor advertisers need entertain any apprehension

that it will be delayed or discontinued during the first year. Whether it will be continued thereafter, will depend on the patronage it may receive.

It will be perceived that we have made some change in our original scheme. According to our *Prospectus*, we contemplated publishing a Magazine of about *sixty-four* pages, containing, together with other matter, *only some of the most important* decisions of the Supreme Court—whereas our present plan is to publish *all the decisions* of the Supreme Court, and that the Magazine shall contain about *ninety-six* pages. This change has necessarily caused a change in the price of the subscription from \$5, to \$8. This latter sum will, consequently, be the price for one year, or \$4,50 for six months.

All *Editorial Communications* will be addressed to BENNETT & OWEN, Attorneys, San Francisco.

Business Communications must be addressed to D. S. CUTTER, 522 Merchant Street, San Francisco.